

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 WWW.uspto.gov

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE 10/046,205 Masaya Hiramitsu Q68085 2511 01/16/2002 EXAMINER 10/20/2003 23373 7590 SUGHRUE MION, PLLC WYROZEBSKI LEE, KATARZYNA I 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER WASHINGTON, DC 20037 1734

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.		Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary	10/046,205		HIRAMITSU, MASAYA		
	Examiner		Art Unit		
	Katarzyna Wyroz		1714		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover	sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status	36(a). In no event, however within the statutory minimal will expire Source the application to	ver, may a reply be timenum of thirty (30) days IX (6) MONTHS from become ABANDONE	ely filed  will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication.  (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	·				
2a)☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ Thi	is action is non-fir	ıal.			
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requiren	nent.	•		
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner	<u> </u>				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accept					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on			ved by the Examiner.		
If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep	•	on.			
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	ammer.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
13) △ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35	U.S.C. § 119(a	)-(d) or (t).		
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:		_			
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents			<del></del>		
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International But  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	reau (PCT Rule 1	7.2(a)).			
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	c priority under 35	U.S.C. § 119(6	e) (to a provisional application).		
a) The translation of the foreign language pro					
Attachment(s)	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	- · 00 · - ·	<u> </u>		
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 06</li> </ol>	5) 🔲		(PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)		

Application/Control Number: 10/046,205

Art Unit: 1714

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1-5, 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by SANDSTROM (US 5,901,766).

The prior art of SANDSTROM discloses composition for a tire tread of a pneumatic tire.

According to the example 4 of the prior art of SANDSTROM following is rubber and resin composition:

Samples	· 4
E-SBR <sup>1</sup>	. 50
Polybutadiene <sup>2</sup>	50
Coumarone Indene Resin3	7.5
Phenol/Acetylene Resin4	7.5
Processing Oil <sup>5</sup>	31.25
Max Torque (dNm)	28.4
Min Torque (dNm)	5.6
Delta Torque (dNm)	22.8
T90 (min)	14.0
Stress-Strain	a, 18 min/150
<del></del>	

Wherein cumarone indene resin is utilized in amount of 7.5 pbw. In addition bound styrene content in the composition above is:

as disclosed underneath the same table II in col. 8.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>An emulsion polymerized styrene/butsdiene nubber containing 23.5 percent by weight bound styrene,  $Tg = -55^{\circ} C$ , ML1 + 4 (100° C.) = 50, containing

Application/Control Number: 10/046,205

Art Unit: 1714

The fillers in the prior art of SANDSTROM are not disclosed in Table II, however specification discloses use of both silica and carbon black. Silicas can be utilized in amount of 15-80 pbw (col. 4, lines 36-38) and carbon blacks can be utilized in amount of 5-125 pbw (col. 5, line 20).

The vulcanization accelerators in the examples are utilized in amount of 1.55 pbw. Although examples disclose sulfenamide, the specification teaches that preferred accelerators in addition to sulfenamide include thiuram (col. 6, lines 8-9).

In the light of the above disclosure, the prior art of SANDSTROM clearly anticipates the requirements of claims rejected above.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
  - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Application/Control Number: 10/046,205

Art Unit: 1714

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over SANDSTROM (US 5,901,766).

In addition to the discussion in paragraph 2 of this office action, the prior art of SANDSTROM renders claim 6 obvious for following reasons:

Although the particular ratio of carbon black to silica being 45/20 to 30/35 are not disclosed, such would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art. Table I of SANDSTROM teaches use of carbon black in 70 pbw. This would suggest that the amount of reinforcing filler should not exceed 70 pbw. Therefore combination of carbon black and silica which add up to no more that 70 pbw would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art.

Carbon black and silica are both reinforcing fillers widely utilized in tire industry. Their use is as the name speaks to reinforce rubber composition, what is they are utilized for the same purpose.

In the light of the above disclosure, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to utilize carbon black and silica in appropriate ration and thereby obtain the claimed invention. It is well settled that it is prima facie obvious to combine two ingredients, each of which is targeted by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose. *In re Linder* 457 F,2d 506,509, 173 USPQ 356, 359 (CCPA 1972).

During approximately December 4<sup>th</sup> through December 18<sup>th</sup>, the USPTO will be moving

to a new building in Alexandria, wherein new phone numbers will be given. The new phone

number for the examiner of record is 571-272-1127.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Katarzyna Wyrozebski Lee whose telephone number is (703)

306-5875. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 6:30 AM-4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on (703) 306-2777. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Katarzyna Wyrozebski Lee

**Primary Examiner** 

Art Unit 1714

October 15, 2003